

over their own nation. They want U.S. troops out.

Real leadership in Iraq means bringing our troops home and offering humanitarian assistance to the people of Iraq. We must join with the international community to provide relief, reconstruction, and reconciliation. This is the only way forward for Iraq.

Force and occupation will not rebuild Iraq. It will not provide healthier communities. And most importantly, it will not provide a peaceful future for the people of Iraq.

Bring our troops home. Bring hope to our military families at home and the Iraq families yearning for peace.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RUSH LIMBAUGH'S "PHONY SOLDIER" COMMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Well, Rush Limbaugh is at it again. Unable to defend an indefensible war in Iraq, he has once again resorted to "sliming" the messenger. In this case, unbelievably, the messengers he's going after are the brave men and women who have served their country in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other wars.

Men and women who serve in Iraq differ from Rush Limbaugh in two critical ways. First, unlike Mr. Limbaugh, they actually served in the military. Second, unlike Mr. Limbaugh, they understand that the war in Iraq is making our country less safe and destroying the military.

How dare Rush Limbaugh label anyone who has served in the military as a "phony soldier." How dare he say that his views in Iraq, formed in the comfort of his radio studio, are legitimate, while the views of those whose opinions were forged on the battlefield are not. Could Rush Limbaugh actually face soldiers who have risked their lives and tell them that their beliefs don't matter?

These are soldiers like Brandon Friedman, a former rifle platoon leader in the Army's 101st Airborne Division who fought in Afghanistan in 2002 and commanded troops in Iraq. He says, "The escalation of the war is failing and now the mission must change. The

fact is," he says, "the Iraq war has kept us from devoting assets we need to fight terrorists worldwide, as evidenced by the fact that Osama bin Laden is still on the loose and al Qaeda has been able to rebuild. We need an effective strategy that takes the fight to our real enemies abroad, and the best way to do that is to get our troops out of the middle of the civil war in Iraq." Is Brandon Friedman a phony?

Or Josh Gaines, who earned the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal and the National Defense Service Medal during his 2 years in Iraq, he believes the war in Iraq was a mistake from the beginning. Is he a phony? Or retired General William Odom, the head of the National Security Agency during the Reagan administration. His advice: "The sensible policy is not to stay the course in Iraq. It is rapid withdrawal, re-establishing strong relations with our allies in Europe, showing confidence in the U.N. Security Council, and trying to knit together a large coalition, including the major states of Europe, Japan, South Korea, China and India to back a strategy for stabilizing the area from the eastern Mediterranean to Afghanistan to Pakistan." General Odom says: "Until the United States withdraws from Iraq and admits its strategic error, no such coalition can be formed. Thus those fear leaving a mess are actually helping make things worse while preventing a new strategic approach with some promise of success."

Does Rush Limbaugh really want to look General Odom in the eye and call him a phony? I believe that we should all pay attention to the views of Brandon Friedman and Josh Gaines and General Odom whose beliefs, like their military experience, are real. And while we're at it, let's pay attention to the 72 percent of American troops serving in Iraq who also think the U.S. should exit the country within the next year, and more than one in four who say the troops should leave immediately, according to the Zogby poll. I guess they're all a bunch of phonies, according to Rush Limbaugh.

Our military men and women deserve respect. Apparently, however, Mr. Limbaugh thinks they deserve to be smeared and belittled unless they happen to agree with him. I understand why Rush Limbaugh cannot debate this war on the merits, but bashing soldiers and veterans who disagree with him is unpatriotic and un-American.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LAMBORN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WATERS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DREIER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE VOTING IRREGULARITIES OF AUGUST 2, 2007, 110TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with clause 2(a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I respectfully submit the rules of the Select Committee to Investigate the Voting Irregularities of August 2, 2007 for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Select Committee adopted these rules by voice vote, a quorum being present, at our organizational meeting on September 27, 2007.

RULES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE VOTING IRREGULARITIES OF AUGUST 2, 2007, 110TH CONGRESS, ADOPTED SEPTEMBER 27, 2007

Resolved, That the Rules of the Select Committee to Investigate the Voting Irregularities of August 2, 2007 shall be as follows: Except as provided in paragraphs (1)–(4), rule XI and clause 2(c) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be rules of the Select Committee.

(1) Regular Meeting Days. If the House is in session, the Committee shall meet on the first Thursday of each month at 9 a.m. for the consideration of any pending business. If the House is not in session on that day and the Committee has not met during such month, the Committee shall meet at the earliest practicable opportunity when the House is again in session. The Chairman may, at his discretion, cancel, delay, or defer any meeting required under this section, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

(2) Questioning Witnesses. The chairman, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, may permit an equal number of majority and minority members to question a witness for a specified period that is equal for each side and not longer than 30 minutes for each side at a time. The chairman and ranking minority member shall each determine how to allocate this time for their members.

(3) Views. Supplemental, minority, or additional views may be filed under rule XI and rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and the time allowed for filing of such views shall be three calendar days, beginning on the day of notice, but excluding

Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays (unless the House is in session on such a day), unless the Committee agrees to a different time.

(4) Quorum. For the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence, one Member from the majority and one Member from the minority shall constitute a quorum, unless otherwise agreed to by the ranking minority member.

UNITED STATES-PERU TRADE
PROMOTION AGREEMENT—MES-
SAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF
THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC.
NO. 110-60)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit legislation and supporting documents to implement the United States-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement (Agreement). The Agreement represents a historic development in our relations with Peru, and it reflects the commitment of the United States to supporting democracy and economic growth in Peru. It will also help Peru battle illegal crop production by creating alternative economic opportunities.

In negotiating this Agreement, my Administration was guided by the objectives set out in the Trade Act of 2002. The Agreement will create significant new opportunities for American workers, farmers, ranchers, businesses, and consumers by opening new markets and eliminating barriers.

Under the Agreement, tariffs on approximately 80 percent of U.S. exports will be eliminated immediately. This will help to level the playing field, since over 97 percent of our imports from Peru already enjoy duty-free access to our market under U.S. trade preference programs. United States agricultural exports will enjoy substantial new improvements in access. Almost 90 percent, by value, of current U.S. agricultural exports markets will be able to enter Peru duty-free immediately, compared to less than 2 percent currently. By providing for the effective enforcement of labor and environmental laws, combined with strong remedies for noncompliance, the Agreement will contribute to improved worker rights and high levels of environmental protection in Peru.

The Agreement forms an integral part of my Administration's larger strategy of opening markets around the world through negotiating and concluding global, regional, and bilateral trade initiatives. The Agreement provides the opportunity to strengthen our economic and political ties with the Andean region, and underpins U.S. support for democracy and freedom while contributing to further hemispheric integration.

Approval of this Agreement is in our national interest.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 27, 2007.

□ 1900

AMERICA'S HERITAGE IS AT RISK
AS OUR NATION LOSES ITS WAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, when our Nation was founded, its spirit of independence and liberty permeated its creation. Freedom, independence, and liberty are the core of the American spirit. But I fear that our priceless heritage is at risk as our Nation loses its way. We are \$10 trillion in debt, dependent more and more on foreign borrowing every day to conduct wars not being paid for. We are energy dependent, not independent. We are dependent on foreign petroleum, 75 percent of which we import from foreign countries across the rest of the world. Most of those places are undemocratic regimes. We are dependent on that petroleum. We are dependent on importing capital because we are \$10 trillion in debt. Now we have the highest home foreclosure rate since the Great Depression.

The State that I represent, Ohio, which has lost so many jobs through outsourcing to foreign countries, is hard hit, as is our sister State north of us, the State of Michigan. Why? These are all the result of Wall Street draining people's accumulated equity from their largest form of savings, their home. When you have that amount of debt, you have to monetize it. You have to cover the gap. So what do you do? You send letters to the American people. The big banks are saying, "Do you want to borrow against your home equity? Do you want to borrow \$20,000 or \$30,000 or \$40,000?" That happened across our country, and now many people are living in homes where they owe more on their mortgage than the basic value of the home itself.

We are losing our independence. Families are losing their independence. In turn, the Nation is losing its independence. At some point, you might say, the chickens of profligacy have come home to roost.

We witness parts of our Nation being pawned off every day. We see turnpikes that the States used to own and run being rented out to foreign countries for 99 years, and then the taxpayers of those States having to pay for them again with interest over 99 years. And the debt never ends.

The latest fire sale, as was reported in the New York Times yesterday, is NASDAQ, one of the pillars of our stock market. The New York Times reported that an undemocratic country, the United Arab Emirates, which is a Middle Eastern fiefdom, intends to buy one-third of the NASDAQ. That is incredible.

Let me ask, why would we sell any part of the heart of our economy to a foreign government or any undemocratic interest? Why we would do this, unless we were broke. And we are broke. We are only holding it together with borrowing. If our government tried to buy one-third of the NASDAQ, I could just hear the voices in here saying, "socialism, socialism." It wouldn't be allowed. We would stop it. Why would we allow any foreign government or any foreign interest to purchase one-third of one of our pillars of capitalism in this country? The United Arab Emirates is notorious for human trafficking, for money laundering, including from terrorist networks. And we are going to allow them to buy one-third of the NASDAQ?

The United Arab Emirates is a hub in the Middle East for recirculating petrodollars that are taken out of our pockets because we are energy dependent here at home rather than energy independent. Those countries have amassed billions and billions and billions of dollars to fuel their undemocratic oil dictatorships. The UAE has no democratic government, no democratically elected government. Its citizens have no right to freely change their government. We have laws that tell us how often we have to change our Government. There is no freedom of representation in the United Arab Emirates. Why would we allow them to buy one-third of our stock market?

Mr. Speaker, I intend to introduce legislation to block this latest sellout of America.

IS AMERICA READY FOR AN
EXPENSIVE HEATING SEASON?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is September 27. We are just finishing the first week of fall. It doesn't seem possible, Mr. Speaker, that summer has slipped by. We are now entering the fall season. That means the cool nights and chilly days will soon be coming. The northern part of the country has already had a couple of movements of Canadian air down where we have chilly nights. That will soon cover most of the country. That means the heating season will begin.

The question I ask is this: Is America ready for the most expensive heating season that we may have ever faced? Yes, all of the last week, the first week of fall, we have had \$82 oil. In fact, at the close today it was just 12 cents, it would have been \$83 oil. I remember when \$50 oil caused a panic, and \$60 oil was going to be the end of all, and then \$70 oil, and this week we have had \$82 oil all week. I haven't heard many people talk about it because that price hasn't hit us yet. It hasn't hit the pump yet. It hasn't hit home heating costs yet.